Applicant: Takeshi Nishi, et al Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-121003 / US3254D1D1

Serial No.: 10/735,885

Filed: December 16, 2003

Page : 4 of 5

REMARKS

Claims 11-16 are pending in the application, with claims 11-13 and 15 being independent. Claims 13-16 have been amended in response to the rejection under section 112, first paragraph. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 13-16 have been rejected under section 112, first paragraph, due to an alleged failure of the specification to comply with the written description requirement. The rejection indicates that the specification does not describe optically active substances and dichroic dye molecules, as recited in claims 13 and 15, or that the dichroic dye molecules are oriented in all directions around the axis that is perpendicular to the substrate, as recited in claims 14 and 16.

Claims 13 and 15 have been amended to eliminate the reference to the optically active substances and, instead, to recite only a single optically active substance. Claims 14 and 16 have been amended to recite that the dichroic dye molecules are oriented in different directions around the axis that is perpendicular to the substrate, as recited in the application at, for example, page 7, lines 1-6 and page 3.

As to dichroic dye molecules, applicant notes that such molecules are shown in Figs. 3 and 4. Moreover, applicant notes further that, contrary to the argument set forth in the rejection, the recitation of dichroic dye molecules does not require the molecules to be molecules of different kinds of dichroic dye materials.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 11-16 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Sano (U.S. 4,694,188) in view of Wakita (U.S. Patent No. 5,574,593). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because there would have been no motivation to combine Sano and Wakita in the manner set forth in the rejection, and because the rejection has failed to set forth such a motivation and, accordingly, the rejection has failed to allege a prima facie case of obviousness.

The rejection contends that "it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the guest-host type LC including a nematic liquid crystal, an optically active substance (chiral), and a dichroic dye in Sano's liquid crystal device for high contrast without requiring any polarizers, as taught by Wakita et al." This mere statement of what Wakita shows in no way

Applicant: Takeshi Nishi, et al Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-121003 / US3254D1D1

Serial No.: 10/735,885

Filed: December 16, 2003

Page : 5 of 5

shows why there would have been any motivation to modify the device of Sano in view of Wakita.

Moreover, while Wakita indicates, in the abstract, that a polarizer is not required, Wakita, as shown in Fig. 1, operates using the relationship between a liquid crystal 8 that is oriented according to an electric field perpendicular to the substrates 2 and 3, a retardation film 13 that is a quarter-wavelength plate disposed under the liquid crystal, and a reflection pate 14 that is disposed under the retardation film 13. (See Wakita at col. 7, line 66 to col. 9, line 7.)

Accordingly, nothing in Wakita, which relies on a structure that is substantially different from that of Sano, would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Sano's device in the manner set forth in the rejection.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The fee in the amount of \$450 for the two-month extension of time is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 24, 2006

John F. Hayden Reg. No. 37,640

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W. - 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

/adt

07977 121003 response.doc